Application Number 10/534438 Response to Final Office Action dated 06/05/2007

## REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks and amendments herein. Applicants amend claim 1 and in doing so Applicants have not added new matter; support in the originally filed specification for the limits of the adhesive is shown in Figure 1A. Applicants request the Examiner enter the amendment to claim 1 because it put the claims in condition for allowance and/or better condition for appeal. No new issues have been raised because Applicants have further attempted to clarify the nature of the adhesive in the remarks and previous amendments filed March 23, 2007. Claim 1 is amended, claims 2-16 are original claims, and claims 17-20, previously withdrawn, are canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. Claims 1-16 are pending.

## The Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants maintain their traversal of the rejection of claims 1-7 and 11-16 as being obvious in view of Takahashi '664 and amend claim 1 to specifically point out and distinctly claim that an end portion of the adhesive layer is formed on the incident end side of the optical waveguide such that the adhesive layer is positioned inside and adheres to a surface of a wall of the first groove under the optical waveguide and does not contact with the outgoing end face of the semiconductor laser. An advantage of this claimed feature is that the end portion of the adhesive layer effectively positions and stabilizes the end of the optical waveguide precisely with respect to the semiconductor laser regardless of any rise in temperature from the devices.

The rejection contends that Takahashi '664 discloses that an end of the adhesive layer on the incident end side of the optical waveguide is positioned inside the first groove and is in contact with a surface of the wall of the first groove. Applicants disagree. With respect to Figure 7, Takahashi '664 specifically states that Figure 7, the "enlarged plan view of the region ... of the first embodiment" and "does not show the vertical positional arrangement between" the preliminary securing portion 40 and the final securing portion 41 (emphasis added). The view, however, that does clearly show the vertical positional relationship between the two securing portions is Figure 8, "an

Application Number 10/534438
Response to Final Office Action dated 06/05/2007

enlarged sectional view of the region ... of the first embodiment". As is clearly illustrated in Figure 8, neither the final securing portion 40 nor the preliminary securing portion 41 adheres to a first wall of a discharge groove 35. The rejection is not free to create features in a reference which are not taught or suggested, and indeed, which features are clearly contrary to the teachings as described in the specification and numerous figures.

Applicants further point out that Takahashi '664 teaches a discharge groove 35 that so effectively discharges the securing portion that no securing portion adheres to a surface of a wall of the first groove, as required by claim 1. In other words, Figures 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 19 clearly show that there is no adhesive adhering to the wall of the discharge groove 35.

## Conclusion

Applicants acknowledge that claims 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered because no new issues are raised and the amendment would put the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants request prompt allowance of the pending claims and issuance of the patent. The Examiner is invited to telephone the attorney Douglas P. Mueller at 612.455.3804 should any minor issues remain before allowance of the claims and issuance of the patent.

Respectfully submitted,

52835
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Dated: September 5, 2007

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. Box 2902

Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902 (612) 455-3800

Curtis B. Hamre Reg. No. 29,165

CBH/KO/Is